

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 5, 7-9, and 11-13 were canceled; claims 1-4, 6, 10, and 14-24 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite similar features. Claim 1 is representative of the independent claims.

Claim 1 recites:

identifying that a problem has occurred in a program that is in the client computer system;
(Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 19-20.)

responsive to identifying the problem, initiating, by a user of the client computer system, an agent that executes within the client computer system; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 21-22.)

associating a problem identifier with the problem; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 22-24.)

taking diagnostic steps, by the user, to diagnose the problem; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 24-25.)

automatically recording, by the agent into a script in the client computer system, the diagnostic steps as the diagnostic steps are taken by the user, the user not taking any action to have the diagnostic steps recorded; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 25-27.)

storing the problem identifier in the script; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 24-25.)

indicating, by the user to the agent, that the problem has been diagnosed; (Support for can be found in the specification starting on page 11, line 27, and ending on page 12, line 1.)

taking correction steps, by the user, to fix the problem; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 12, lines 1-3.)

automatically recording, by the agent into the script, the correction steps as the correction steps are taken by the user, the user not taking any action to have the correction steps recorded; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 12, line 3.)

providing, by the user to the agent, an input to indicate whether the correction steps corrected the problem; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 12, lines 19-20.)

responsive to the correction steps correcting the problem:

automatically sending, by the agent, a solution to a server computer system, the solution including the correction steps and the problem identifier; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 12, lines 20-21.)

responsive to the server computer system receiving the solution, searching, by the server computer system, a rules database that is included in the server computer system for a stored solution that includes the problem identifier; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 13, lines 1-2.)

in response to locating the stored solution in the rules database in the server computer system, determining whether the stored solution includes stored correction steps that are the same as said correction steps; (Support for can be found in the specification on page 13, lines 2-4.)

in response to the stored correction steps being different from the correction steps, identifying differences between the stored correction steps and the correction steps, and notifying a server computer system administrator about the differences; and (Support for can be found in the specification on page 13, lines 4-8.)

responsive to the administrator approving an update, updating the stored solution to include said correction steps to form a second stored solution. (Support for can be found in the specification on page 13, lines 4-8.)

Claims 2, 15, and 20 recite similar features. Claim 2 recites: “said correction steps that are taken to fix the problem including: identifying a patch that is necessary in order to fix the problem; and obtaining, by the client computer system from a software database that is included in the server computer system, the patch.” Support can be found in the specification on page 15, lines 12-16.

Claims 3, 17, and 21 recite similar features. Claim 3 recites: “connecting, by a second agent in a second client computer system, to said server computer system; obtaining, by said second agent, updates to a rules database, which is included in said second client computer system; said updates including said second stored solution; in response to an occurrence of said problem in said second client computer system, using said second stored solution from said rules database in said second client computer system to fix said problem in said second client computer system.” Support can be found in the specification on page 16, lines 1-8; and page 19, lines 6-11.

Claims 4 and 22 recite similar features. Claim 4 recites: “updating the stored solution to form a second stored solution by removing steps from said stored correction steps and adding steps to said stored solution steps.” Support can be found in the specification on page 18, lines 23-24.

Claims 10, 16, and 24 recite similar features. Claim 10 recites: “in response to not locating a stored solution in the rules database in the server computer system that includes the problem identifier,

saving the solution in the rules database in the server computer system.” Support can be found in the specification on page 19, lines 2-5.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner states:

The claims appear to be lacking critical steps that would resemble an advancement in technology. Examiner has provided a claim interpretation under the claims to indicate the indefiniteness of the present limitations. Although, the claims are part of the original disclosure, the legal claim for exclusivity of claims could be interpreted as mundane tasks which have been performed for decades. Script also lacks sufficient limitations to distinguish from a program.

Office Action dated April 10, 2007, page 2.

Applicants believe the extensive amendments to the claims overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beginning Visual C++ 5, by Ivor Horton, March 1997 in view of McAfee Oil Change, User's Guide 1999. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Ivor teaches dynamic link libraries (DLLs). A DLL is a collection of modules that can be used by any number of different programs. *McAfee Oil* teaches gathering information about software updates, and storing this information on a server. It can then scan for products on a computer, install updates automatically, and reverse those updates.

The Examiner relies on *McAfee Oil* to teach receiving a solution to a problem with a program on a client data processing system. Applicants now claim identifying that a problem has occurred in a program that is in the client computer system; responsive to identifying the problem, initiating, by a user of the client computer system, an agent that executes within the client computer system; and associating a problem identifier with the problem. *McAfee Oil* teaches gathering information about software updates. It does not teach identifying a problem, and then initiating an agent by a user of the client in response to identifying the problem. It does not teach associating a problem identifier with the problem.

The Examiner states that the combination of *Ivor* and *McAfee Oil* teaches a solution that includes a process created while solving the problem on the client. Specifically, the Examiner states that *Ivor* teaches creating DLLs, which run on many different machines. The Examiner also states that *McAfee Oil* teaches distributing over the Internet to many different machines. The combination of creating DLLs and then distributing those DLLs to many different machines, does not teach the features of Applicants' amended claims.

Applicants now claim taking diagnostic steps, by the user, to diagnose the problem; automatically recording, by the agent into a script in the client computer system, the diagnostic steps as the diagnostic steps are taken by the user, the user not taking any action to have the diagnostic steps recorded; storing the problem identifier in the script; and indicating, by the user to the agent, that the problem has been diagnosed.

Neither *Ivor* nor *McAfee Oil* teaches taking diagnostic steps, by a user, to diagnose a problem that has been identified as occurring in a program that is in the client computer system, and for which a problem identifier has been associated. Neither *Ivor* nor *McAfee Oil* teaches automatically recording these diagnostic steps into a script in the client computer system. Neither reference teaches the user not taking any action to have the diagnostic steps recorded.

Applicants now claim indicating, by the user to the agent, that the problem has been diagnosed; taking correction steps, by the user, to fix the problem; and automatically recording, by the agent into the script, the correction steps as the correction steps are taken by the user, where the user does not take any action to have the correction steps recorded.

The Examiner relies on *Ivor* to teach building code that can be used to fix programs on computers. *Ivor* does not teach, however, the user indicating to the agent that the problem has been diagnosed; taking correction steps to fix the problem; and automatically recording these correction steps as they are taken by the user. *Ivor* does not teach the user not taking any action to have the correction steps recorded.

The combination of *Ivor* and *McAfee Oil* does not render Applicants' amended claims obvious because the combination does not teach the features of Applicants' amended claims. More specifically, the combination does not render Applicants' claims obvious because the combination does not teach or suggest automatically recording diagnostic steps taken by a user to diagnose a problem. This recording of the diagnostic steps is done automatically by an agent in the client without the user taking any action to have the steps recorded. The combination also does not teach automatically recording correction steps taken by a user to fix the problem. This recording of the correction steps is done automatically by an agent in the client without the user taking any action to have the steps recorded.

The combination also does not teach the agent automatically sending a solution to a server computer system, where the solution includes the correction steps and the problem identifier. The combination does not teach the server computer system searching its rules database for a stored solution that includes the problem identifier; if the rules database includes the stored solution, and stored correction steps included in the stored solution are different from the correction steps, differences between the stored correction steps and the correction steps being identified. The combination does not teach an administrator being notified about the differences, and if the administrator approves an update, the stored solution being updated to include the correction steps to form a second stored solution.

The combination does not teach the features of claims 3, 17, and 21, which recite similar features. The combination does not teach connecting, by a second agent in a second client computer system, to said server computer system; obtaining, by said second agent, updates to a rules database, which is included in said second client computer system; the updates including said second stored solution; and in response to an occurrence of said problem in said second client computer system, using said second stored solution from said rules database in said second client computer system to fix said problem in said second client computer system.

Because the combination of *Ivor* and *McAfee Oil* does not teach or suggest the combination of Applicants' amended claims, the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over cited art and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants